1 2 3 4 5	David J. Kaminski (SBN: 128509) kaminskid@cmtlaw.com Tamar Gabriel (SBN: 266860) gabrielt@cmtlaw.com CARLSON & MESSER LLP 5959 W. Century Boulevard, Suite 1214 Los Angeles, California 90045 (310) 242-2200 Telephone (310) 242-2222 Facsimile	
6 7	Attorneys for Defendant, DIVERSIFIED CONSULTANTS, INC.	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	NORTHERN DI	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11		
12	HARRY LEBLANC,	CASE NO.
13	Plaintiff,	
14		
15	vs.	
16		NOTICE OF REMOVAL
17	DIVERSIFIED CONSULTANTS, INC.; and Does 1 to 20, INCLUSIVE,)))
18	Defendant.))
19		
20))
21	<u> </u>	
22	<u>DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF REMOVAL</u>	
23	Defendant DIVERSIFIED CONSULTANTS, INC. hereby files this notice of removal	
24	under 28 U.S.C. §1446(a).	
25	INTRODUCTION	
26	1. Defendant is DIVERSIFIED CONSULTANTS, INC. ("Defendant"); Plaintiff is	
27		
28	HARRY LEBLANC ("Plaintiff").	
	{00017756;1}	

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

2. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff initially filed this case on April 17, 2014 in the Superior Court of California, County of Alameda, Case No. RG14721874. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit "A."

- 3. On April 23, 2014 Defendant was personally served with the Summons and a copy of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 4. As Defendant received Plaintiff's Complaint on April 23, 2014, Defendant files this notice of removal within the 30-day time period required by 28 U.S.C. §1446(b), and as extended via FRCP 6. See *Wells v. Gateways Hosp. & Mental Health Ctr.*, 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 2287 at *2 (9th Cir. Cal. Jan. 30, 1966).

A. BASIS FOR REMOVAL

- 5. Removal is proper because Plaintiff's Complaint involves a federal question. 28 U.S.C. §§1331, 1441(b); Long v. Bando Mfg. of Am., Inc., 201 F.3d 754, 757-58 (6th Cir. 2000); Peters v. Union Pac. R.R., 80 F.3d 257, 260 (8th Cir. 1996). Specifically, Plaintiff has alleged claims that arise under 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. for alleged violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act and 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 et seq. for alleged violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. It is therefore an action of which this Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and may be removed to this Court by Defendant pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 6. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §1441(a) because this district and division embrace the place where the removed action has been pending.
- 7. Defendant will promptly file a copy of this notice of removal with the clerk of the state court where the action has been pending.

///

B. JURY DEMAND

8. Plaintiff demands a jury in the state court action. Defendant also demands a jury trial.

C. CONCLUSION

9. Defendant respectfully requests removal of this action as it involves a Federal question under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §1692, et seq. and the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 et seq.

DATED: May 23, 2014

CARLSON & MESSER LLP

By: /s/ Tamar Gabriel
David J. Kaminski
Tamar Gabriel
Attorneys for Defendant,
DIVERSIFIED CONSULTANTS, INC.